

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in this application. Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, 6, 16, 19, 20, 23, 25, and 26 in order to expedite prosecution. No new matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Examiner Interview

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Wong for conducting a telephone interview with Applicant's representative on June 16, 2008. During the interview, Examiner Wong and Applicant's representative discussed the independent claims, the applied references, and the grounds of rejection. The substance of the interview is reflected by the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection

Claims 1-8, 10-17, 19-21, and 23-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Japanese Published Patent Application 2002-109194 A to Nishidate ("Nishidate") in view of United States Published Patent Application (USPPA) 2001/0043591 to Nance et al. ("Nance"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claims 1 and 23 have been amended to recite "retrieving said caller information at said web server directly from a caller database using said call information, said caller information comprising an interactive voice response script or a web page template associated with said caller; retrieving call context information from a computer-telephony integration server that has registered said telephone call; generating a dynamic web page at said web server from a plurality of web page templates using said caller information and said call context information, said plurality of web page templates selected at said web server by a selection module; and sending said web page in response to said first request."

Independent claims 16 and 19 have been amended to recite "a web page generator to retrieve said caller information comprising an interactive voice response script or a

web page template associated with said caller directly from a caller database using said call information, retrieve call context information from a computer-telephony integration server that has registered said telephone call, generate a web page from a plurality of web page templates using said caller information and said call context information, said plurality of web page templates selected at said web page generator by a selection module, and send said web page in response to said first request.”

Applicant submits that Nishidate, as modified by Nance, fails to teach or suggest at least the above-identified language of amended independent claims 1, 16, 19, and 23. At page 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner correctly states that Nishidate, as modified by Nance, does not disclose the web page generator comprising a plurality of templates to generate web pages and a selection module to select a template for the web page.

Applicants also submit that the other cited references fail to show a web page generator comprising a plurality of templates to generate web pages and a selection module to select a template for the web page. For example, although USPPA 2003/0061569 A1 to Aoki (“Aoki”) discloses selection of web page templates by a user from those provided by a web server at a fax machine, Aoki does not disclose selection of web page templates by the web server. Further, Aoki does not disclose that a web page is generated using caller information, call context information, and a web page template. Therefore, Aoki also does not disclose generating a web page from a plurality of web page templates using caller information and call context information and the plurality of web page templates selected at said web page generator by a selection module as recited in amended independent claims 1, 16, 19, and 23.

Furthermore, Applicant submits that Nishidate, as modified by Nance, fails to teach or suggested retrieving the caller information at said web server directly from a caller database using said call information, said caller information comprising an interactive voice response script or a web page template associated with said caller. Although Nishidate discloses that Web content information is notified to a web server from an operator at a client terminal, it does not teach or suggest retrieving caller information at the web server directly from a caller database using call information, the caller information comprising an interactive voice response script or a web page template

associated with the caller. Therefore, Nishidate fails to disclose retrieving said caller information at said web server directly from a caller database using said call information, said caller information comprising an interactive voice response script or a web page template associated with said caller as recited in amended independent claims 1, 16, 19, and 23.

Applicant submits that the teachings of Nance do not remedy the deficiencies of Nishidate with respect to amended independent claims 1, 16, 19, and 23. Namely, Nance does not teach or fairly suggest retrieving said caller information at said web server directly from a caller database using said call information, said caller information comprising an interactive voice response script or a web page template associated with said caller as recited in amended independent claims 1, 16, 19, and 23.

Therefore, even if Aoki, Nance, and Nishidate could be combined, which Applicant does not admit, such combination would still fail to teach or suggest all of the features of independent amended claims 1, 16, 19, and 23. As such, Applicant submits that Nishidate, Nance, and Aoki are insufficient to render obvious amended independent claims 1, 16, 19, and 23, regardless of whether such references are taken alone or in combination with each other. Applicant submits, therefore, that dependent claims 2-8, 10-14, 16, 17, 20, 21, and 24-26 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency, as well as on their own merits.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-8, 10-17, 19-21, and 23-26.

Claims 9 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishidate in view of Nance and further in view of USPPA 2004/0083479 A1 to Bondarenko et al. (“Bondarenko”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant submits that the teachings of Bondarenko do not remedy the deficiencies of Nishidate with respect to amended independent claims 1 and 19. Namely, Bondarenko does not teach or fairly suggest retrieving said caller information at said web server directly from a caller database using said call information, said caller information comprising an interactive voice response script or a web page template

associated with said caller; retrieving call context information from a computer-telephony integration server that has registered said telephone call; generating a dynamic web page at said web server from a plurality of web page templates using said caller information and said call context information, said plurality of web page templates selected at said web server by a selection module; and sending said web page in response to said first request as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 19.

Therefore, even if Bondarenko, Nishidate, and Nance could be combined, which Applicant does not admit, such combination would still fail to teach or suggest all of the features of independent amended claims 1 and 19. As such, Applicant submits that Nishidate, Nance, and Bondarenko are insufficient to render obvious amended independent claims 1 and 19, regardless of whether such references are taken alone or in combination with each other. Applicant submits, therefore, that dependent claims 9 and 22 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency, as well as on their own merits.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection of claims 9 and 22.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishidate in view of Nance and further in view Aoki. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant submits that the teachings of Aoki do not remedy the deficiencies of Nishidate and Nance with respect to amended independent claim 16. Namely, Aoki does not teach or fairly suggest retrieving said caller information at said web server directly from a caller database using said call information, said caller information comprising an interactive voice response script or a web page template associated with said caller; retrieving call context information from a computer-telephony integration server that has registered said telephone call; generating a dynamic web page at said web server from a plurality of web page templates using said caller information and said call context information, said plurality of web page templates selected at said web server by a selection module; and sending said web page in response to said first request as recited in amended independent claim 16.

Therefore, even if Aoki, Nishidate, and Nance could be combined, which Applicant does not admit, such combination would still fail to teach or suggest all of the features of independent amended 16. As such, Applicant submits that Nishidate, Nance and Aoki are insufficient to render obvious amended independent claim 16, regardless of whether such references are taken alone or in combination with each other. Applicant submits, therefore, that dependent claim 18 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency, as well as on its own merits.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection of claim 18.

Conclusion

It is believed that claims 1-26 are in allowable form. Accordingly, a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Applicant does not otherwise concede, however, the correctness of the Office Action's rejection with respect to any of the dependent claims discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant hereby reserves the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary to further distinguish the dependent claims from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, based on additional features contained in the dependent claims that were not discussed above. A detailed discussion of these differences is believed to be unnecessary at this time in view of the basic differences in the independent claims pointed out above.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to discuss any matter concerning this application.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to Deposit Account 50-4238.

Respectfully submitted,

KACVINSKY LLC



Robert V. Racunas, Reg. No. 43,027
Under 37 CFR 1.34(a)

Dated: July 15, 2008

4500 Brooktree Road, Suite 102
Wexford, PA 15090
(724) 933-5529